

CMER
October 17, 2002
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Carlson, Margen	Intern, DNR
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Edsun, Scott	Colville Confederated Tribe
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER co-chair
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	AMPA, DNR
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Prater, Brian	Campbell Group
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER co-chair
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR
Vaugeios, Laura	DNR

August minutes were approved as amended.

Summary of Decision Points and Action Items:

- McNaughton will research and will take the initiative in developing a program for compliance monitoring that meets those needs along with any compatible needs of the effectiveness monitoring program. (see Budget Update for Details).
- WETSAG: CMER approved WETSAGs request for up to \$1,200 to pay speaker expenses (See SAG Requests)
- UPSAG: CMER approved the scope of work for the Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocol. (See SAG requests)
- SAGE: CMER approved SAGE's request to move forward with development of an RFP without sending the SOW through SRC review; contingent up SAGE receiving feedback from CMER on the SOW and incorporating it. The deadline for comment on this SOW is November 1st. (See SAG requests)
- BTSAG: CMER recommends that DNR sign the contract for the additional \$8,000 to contract with Eddie Cupp to find sites for the Bull Trout overlay study. (See SAG requests). There is no consensus about what to do if DNR refuses to sign the contract and the issue will be brought before CMER for further discussion should this occur.
- Include, in the CMER Handbook, a section covering open reviews and articulating associated costs. (See SRC update)
- Rowton agreed to arrange small group meeting to discuss data retention and storage needs. (See handbook section)
- Handbook committee will collect thoughts regarding public disclosure and communication of CMER information and will then proceed to draft this section. (See handbook section)
- RSAG is seeking a new co-chair. (See SAG issues)
- UPSAG: will prepare a schedule for completion of the PIP pilot study. (See SAG issues)
- LWAG: LWAG will respond to reviewer comments on the RMZ resample. (See SAG issues)
- UPSAG: CMER did not approve the landslide hazard zonation project to move forward. The non-consensus resulted from 1) a concern about the utility of this program given its high cost; and 2) a concern that the study design needed more clarification and a better description of the pros and cons of the proposed approach. It was also recommended that the study include a phased approach with check points. Timothy Quinn said he would provide written comment to UPSAG concerning the study approach issues. CMER will review a revised proposal after any changes that are made as a result of Quinn's comments. The cost issue is a policy concern.

CMER Budget Update: McNaughton indicated that the budget sheet has not changed since the August CMER meeting. McNaughton thanked the group – especially SAG members - for their work to provide project status reports and other details to McNaughton so that invoices can be approved and paid in a timely manner. There is a

Forests and Fish budget committee meeting scheduled for next week to discuss agency budget and the CMER budget.

DNR is required to conduct compliance monitoring and the MDT has an effectiveness monitoring program design that will also require funding. McNaughton is drafting a state budget request for these funds; CMER may or may not get additional funding. Quinn said that the compliance monitoring program has the potential to include some of the effectiveness monitoring components (fish passage and roads), and he asked if DNR could take the initiative in designing a program that meets both the needs of DNR and CMER. Pavel reminded the group that biennial compliance audits are also required and CMER has done these in the past. Suggestions for further research include: look at the most recent compliance audit that CMER conducted (Sherry Felix may know its whereabouts) and look at the recent Oregon Department of Forestry Compliance Monitoring Report.

SAG Requests:

UPSAG, Landslide Hazard Zonation Request: Vaugeios said that UPSAG has put together a proposal to complete the FFR Strategy to address unstable slopes and a proposal for moving forward with this project has been developed and agreed to by UPSAG. UPSAG is now requesting CMER approval of this. More information will be available during the brown bag session.

WETSAG Wetland Literature Review Workshop: Parks sent an e-mail last week requesting an additional \$1,200 from project development funds to pay travel expenses and stipends for speakers at the Wetlands Literature Review workshop. WETSAG anticipated a workshop with local speakers but they had to seek expertise from outside the general vicinity to make the workshop worth-while. Parks said that WETSAG has gone back to the contractor to try and roll the budget expenses into the project but that is impossible. McNaughton added that this contract is really tight and there was very little room for additional expenses.

Consensus: CMER approved WETSAGs request for up to \$1,200 to pay speaker expenses.

UPSAG2, Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocols: Raines requested CMER approval for the scope of work for this project.

Consensus: CMER approved the Scope of work for the Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocol.

SAGE, Wood in Streams Eastern Washington: Peterson said that SAGE has concluded that a literature search for the wood in stream information is necessary. Following that, the group will look at the habitat response to that work. As it looks now, they will go into

the modeling effort further down the road. This proposed SOW was e-mailed last week and SAGE is seeking comment on this and CMER approval to develop an RFP based on this SOW. SAGE is also requesting that SRC review be put aside for this project.

Quinn said that he went through the eastside disturbance regime literature review and there are lessons there about how we should be asking questions; more interaction with reviewers is encouraged. We need to be asking experts in the field for their opinion on what is known; maybe this could be accomplished in a workshop setting (i.e.: The Rocky mountains have a similar ecoregion but it is not the same; therefore literature gathered from there will be good and we will need an expert to tell us how relevant this is to eastern Washington.). Pavel suggested that we forward these questions out with the understanding that the contractors for the literature review will address each individual question by citing all literature available on that topic. Heide added that we are beginning to explore the way that outside research will enter the CMER arena and this is a much broader question than the one SAGE has brought before us today. Both Rowe and McNaughton commented that the SAGE proposal was well-written and thought out and it address most the concerns heard here today.

Consensus: CMER approved SAGE's request to move forward with development of an RFP without sending the SOW through SRC review; contingent upon the fact that SAGE receives feedback from CMER on the SOW and incorporates it. The deadline for comment on this SOW is November 1st.

BTSAG: Jackson forwarded a memo requesting that CMER approve \$8,000 for BTSAG to hire Eddie Cupp to help McFadden find sites for the BTO study. BTSAG has had a very difficult time locating sites for this project and they cannot move forward until sites are found. Cupp is convinced that he can find some sites for this project. Quinn asked if the real issue is that we need CMER to approve this expense before the Forest Practices Division will approve the expense. McFadden has indicated that he supports contracting with Cupp and could use the help. The target sample size is 40 sites and we only have five. Rowe added that the study site criteria are too tightly defined and there are not 40 sites available that meet the criteria. Jackson said that the specific site criteria are important for maintaining the integrity of the study; however, other options may exist (such as omitting one strata) which may reduce the number of sites necessary. Also, the number of sites targeted for the first year is fifteen. BTSAG, at their next meeting, will be discussing contingency plans in case the appropriate number of sites cannot be located. McFadden added that Cupp's work will inform the study in that it will clearly define the number of sites that likely exist. Martin suggested that Cupp also provide information about how many additional sites could be located if the criteria were loosened. Pucci asked whether these sites could be used for other eastside studies as well and McFadden indicated that they could.

Consensus: CMER recommends that DNR sign the contract for the additional \$8,000 to contract with Eddie Cupp to find sites for the Bull Trout overlay study.

Non-Consensus and non-core group consensus: CMER could not reach consensus about what to do if DNR does not now sign the contract with Cupp. It was suggested that CMER Project Development funds be used for the contract, as a backup option.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that the SRC contract is very close to being signed. Costs are going up and CMER will be paying some salary and staff support for the SRC next year. The last snag is that the University of Washington is no longer accepting the AG-approved contract language on data ownership. Currently, the language states that DNR owns the data; but the University's position is that it is owned by the State of Washington and as such they would share in any use or copyrights. Lippke suggested that open reviews of final reports should cost more because of the increased interaction required between reviewers and authors. These procedures need to be in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual when final guidance is reached.

Assignment to CMER Handbook Committee: Ensure that, when a final draft of the handbook is released, there is a section covering open reviews and articulating the associated costs.

Handbook Update: Rowton introduced Margen Carlson who is an intern with DNR and will be consolidating the handbook text and providing technical writing services. The handbook committee has been meeting regularly and Carlson has developed a detailed table of contents which has been distributed to CMER for review and comment. Two sections that will require additional group work are the data and document section and public disclosure and communications of CMER information. Carlson is working closely with the handbook committee to draft the dispute resolution section. Rather than burden CMER with review of this handbook now while the focus is on the workplan, the committee will continue work and plans to have a clear, complete and coherent draft ready for CMER review by early February. Rowe was concerned about the number of pages that will be in the handbook. McFadden said that some of these things are just placeholders and may fall out in the end. Raines asked how much of the manual was devoted to general meeting management tasks. There are portions of the manual that explain general meeting management.

Policy Interaction Plan: Quinn said that McNaughton and others attended the recent policy committee meeting. The co-chairs and McNaughton stressed the need for policy interaction during workplan development, especially prioritization. A meeting between CMER and Policy, where CMER can receive guidance and express their concerns, is scheduled for early November. This afternoon, CMER representatives will be fleshing out the questions we have for policy. The two co-chairs and McNaughton will go to policy and CMER representatives will work with McNaughton, the co-chairs and their stakeholders to be sure that clear background about the issues is communicated to policy representatives. The stakeholders must be clearly informed of the issues to be able to help and the real information exchange at this meeting will be done through the stakeholder group, not the CMER co-chairs or McNaughton. Pucci asked for clarification that

McNaughton, Quinn and Martin will be there as non-partisan unbiased parties and this point was clarified. Quinn said that the guidance being sought will help with project prioritization.

Pucci said that at the FPB October retreat, the Board indicated that they want an answer on the CMZ board manual questions from McNaughton on November 13th. Martin said that this does not fit on the CMER agenda and McNaughton explained that this is on the adaptive management agenda but is not a CMER issue. McNaughton has the broader responsibility of coordinating the adaptive management program, not only CMER.

Prioritization: Pavel provided an update from the prioritization committee. The group is looking at how to categorize projects and what are some of the criteria that we need to use to rank some of those projects. The group will begin using a matrix during their next meeting and are keeping Schedule L-1 and L-2 in mind as they work. Some caucuses are not fully endorsing those documents, but that is the guidance provided by policy at this time. There is a wide range of projects that need prioritization and there is overhead involved with CMER projects, as well as some must do items (i.e. validation projects). There is also a time certain list of requirements that will filter into federal assurances – most of these are already started and the prioritization to date has been good at capturing these types of projects. The group is working on the concepts that Palmquist introduced during the September workshop and that work will be incorporated (risk and uncertainty factors) into any final process. A product will likely be out by the end of the month. Quinn voiced concern about using Schedule L-1 because it was not meant to be a bible for guidance. If we rely on that too heavily, it will hold us back. The CMER prioritization workshop is scheduled for November 20th and 21st and will be facilitated by Thompson Consulting Group.

Workplan: Martin thanked everyone for getting their information in and thanked Palmquist and Schuett-Hames for getting the document to the policy committee. The draft is long (117 pages) and it is fairly confusing; the information must be synthesized and so people can understand it. A small group is working on doing this for the workplan. (Quinn, Schuett-Hames, Ehinger, McNaughton, Martin, and others). They are working on ideas for this and an initial cut will be forwarded to CMER for review soon. Raines said that SAGs are still charged with completing unfinished portions of the workplan. She suggests, from working on the prioritization group, that SAGs will need to provide some of the information. Coordination will be needed between this new group, the prioritization group and the SAGs.

SAG Issues:

ISAG: Cramer said that ISAG has been trying to schedule a fish passage workshop but there were some missteps with getting the invitation out and the organization of the workshop was not coming along as well as ISAG wanted it to. ISAG has come to the

conclusion that more policy direction to focus the approach to fish passage will be necessary. They will regroup after the meeting with policy and decide where to go from there. Jackson added that ISAG is in the process of framing this question for policy now.

LWAG: The statistics workshop is scheduled for October 23rd and 24th and it will happen on schedule.

WETSAG: The literature review workshop is scheduled for November 1st and will occur as scheduled.

RSAG: Hunter has resigned as RSAG co-chair and they will be seeking a new co-chair soon. The group is issuing an open invitation. If you are interested, please contact co-chair Blake Rowe at bsrowe@longfibre.com.

PIP Pilot Study: Quinn asked when we will see this. Raines said that the data is being analyzed and the original workgroup is meeting on October 25th to review the data and analysis and decide how to report it. That group can frame a schedule for completion of the report at that time.

RMZ Resample: LWAG was asked to respond to comments from reviewers and they are working on this task.

Next Meeting: Thursday, November 21

Science Topic: Workplan, Closing the loop

Laura Vaugeois provided lunch time presentation on the Landslide Hazard Zonation Project. UPSAG sought CMER approval to move this project forward. After discussion and comments from the group, CMER reached consensus as recorded below.

Non-Consensus: CMER did not approve this project to move forward. The non-consensus resulted from 1) a concern about the utility of this program given its high cost; and 2) a concern that the study design needed more clarification and a better description of the pros and cons of the proposed approach. It was also recommended that the study include a phased approach with check points. Timothy Quinn said he would provide written comment to UPSAG concerning the study approach issues. CMER will review a revised proposal after any changes that are made as a result of Quinn's comments. The cost issue is a policy concern.